



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/122,484	07/24/1998	TERESA FARIAS LATTER	8285/181	4450
757	7590	09/07/2007	EXAMINER	
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P.O. BOX 10395 CHICAGO, IL 60610			TRAN, QUOC DUC	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2614		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		09/07/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

5

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09122484	7/24/98	LATTER ET AL.	8285/181

EXAMINER

Quoc D. Tran

ART UNIT PAPER

2614 20070901

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

1. The reply brief filed 8/6/2007 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.
2. Attached is a revised copy of the Examiner's Answer that has been corrected to include the "date" of the listed prior art. No response is necessary.



Quoc D Tran
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2614



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

SEP 07 2007

Technology Center 2600

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/122,484

Filing Date: July 24, 1998

Appellant(s): LATTER ET AL.

Matthew T. Ridsdale
For Appellant

***REVISED*
EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the remands from the appeal center to include the date of prior art of record relying upon in rejection of the claims under appeal.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

Bartholomew (5,497,414 – 3/5/1996)

Bartholomew et al (6,167,119 – 12/26/2000)

Tatchell et al (5,905,774 – 5/18/1999)

Jones et al (5,033,076 -- 7/16/1991)

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 57-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartholomew (5,497,414) in view of Tatchell et al (5,905,774).

Consider claims 57-59. Bartholomew teaches a method and a system for processing a call from a calling party at a calling communication station to a called party communication station, comprising a switch (SSP 11-17, fig(s). 2; column(s) 5, line(s) 27-52) operative to generate a query in response to the receipt of the call, wherein the query includes the telephone number associated with the calling communication station (e.g., TCAP query includes a service key which is the calling party's address and digits representing the called party address, column(s) 6, line(s) 6-19); a service control point (ISCP 40, fig(s). 2) coupled with the switch, the SCP being operative to determine whether standard caller ID information for the calling communication station can be provided to the called communication station by analyzing information contained within the query (e.g., comparing the calling party's address or calling party number with data stored in the call processing record (CPR); column(s) 6, line(s) 40 to column(s) 7, line(s) 62); and a service node (a peripheral unit under network control of the ISCP, column(s) 6, line(s) 60 to column(s) 7, line(s) 8) coupled with the SCP, the service node being

operative to transmit a request for PIN or password to the calling communication station in response to a determination that the standard caller ID information cannot be provided to the called communication station (column(s) 7, line(s) 6-8). Bartholomew further teaches in response to this request if the caller keys a special privacy override code (PIN or password) then the call is completed without providing any caller identification information to the called communication station (col. 7, line(s) 53-62).

Bartholomew does not teach requesting for audible caller ID information to the calling communication station in response to a determination that the standard caller ID information cannot be provided to the called communication station and being operative to transmit the audible caller ID information to the called communication station.

Tatchell teaches an apparatus for processing a call from a calling party (calling party 22) at a calling communication station to a called communication station (i.e., subscriber 17a-17n), comprising means for determining whether standard caller identification information for the calling communication station can be provided to the called communication station (e.g., the CLID cannot be verified or detected; column 20 lines 50-51; see figures 8a-b steps 103 and 106); means for transmitting a request for audible caller identification information to the calling communication station in response to a determination that the standard caller identification information cannot be provided to the called communication station (e.g., agent obtains caller's name as delivered over the network or by asking the caller to say their name; figure 8b step 106) for the purposes of providing an improved call screening and prioritization of incoming calls (column(s) 20, line(s) 39-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Tatchell into the teachings of Bartholomew for the purposes mentioned above.

3. Claims 60-66, 68-72, 75-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartholomew (5,497,414) in view of Tatchell et al (5,905,774).

Consider claims 60, 64, 68. Bartholomew teaches a system for processing a call from a calling party at a calling communication station to a called party communication station, comprising a switch (SSP 11-17, fig(s). 2; column(s) 5, line(s) 27-52) operative to generate a query in response to the receipt of the call, wherein the query includes the telephone number associated with the calling communication station (e.g., TCAP query includes a service key which is the calling party's address and digits representing the called party address, column(s) 6, line(s) 6-19); a service control point (ISCP 40, fig(s). 2) coupled with the switch, the SCP being operative to determine whether standard caller ID information for the calling communication station can be provided to the called communication station by analyzing information contained within the query (e.g., comparing the calling party's address or calling party number with data stored in the call processing record (CPR); column(s) 6, line(s) 40 to column(s) 7, line(s) 62); and a service node (a peripheral unit under network control of the ISCP, column(s) 6, line(s) 60 to column(s) 7, line(s) 8) coupled with the SCP, the service node being operative to transmit a request for PIN or password to the calling communication station in response to a determination that the standard caller ID information cannot be provided to the called communication station (column(s) 7, line(s) 6-8). Bartholomew further teaches in response to this request if the caller keys a special privacy override code (PIN or password) then the call is completed without

providing any caller identification information to the called communication station (col. 7, line(s) 53-62).

Bartholomew does not teach requesting for audible caller ID information to the calling communication station in response to a determination that the standard caller ID information cannot be provided to the called communication station and being operative to transmit the audible caller ID information to the called communication station.

Tatchell teaches an apparatus for processing a call from a calling party (calling party 22) at a calling communication station to a called communication station (i.e., subscriber 17a-17n), comprising means for determining whether standard caller identification information for the calling communication station can be provided to the called communication station (e.g., the CLID cannot be verified or detected; column 20 lines 50-51; see figures 8a-b steps 103 and 106); means for transmitting a request for audible caller identification information to the calling communication station in response to a determination that the standard caller identification information cannot be provided to the called communication station (e.g., agent obtains caller's name as delivered over the network or by asking the caller to say their name; figure 8b step 106); and canceling the call in response to input from the called communication station (see figure 8d steps 116-119) for the purposes of providing an improved and user-defined call screening and prioritization of incoming calls (column(s) 20, line(s) 39-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Tatchell into the teachings of Bartholomew for the purposes mentioned above.

Consider claims 61-63. Bartholomew further teaches the limitations of claims 61-63 in (column(s) 6, line(s) 60 to column(s) 7, line(s) 43).

Consider claim 65. Tatchell further teaches the step of transmitting a request for the calling party to speak his or her name (see figure 8b).

Consider claim 66. Tatchell teaches all the subject matter claimed, note see the rejection of claim 60, and further teaches the step of transmitting a text message to the called communication station (e.g., transmitting a text message, and translating the text message to speech; column 18 lines 39-63). Tatchell's column(s) 18, line(s) 56-59, and column(s) 21, line(s) 14-16 disclose the use of text to speech translation in order to provide audible caller ID information to the subscriber. Of course, in case a conventional caller ID information (e.g., not an audible caller ID) to be delivered to the subscriber, there is no need for text to speech translation. Instead, caller ID information in text form would be transmitted to the subscriber.

Consider claims 69-72, 76, 91-93. Bartholomew teaches a system for processing a call from a calling party at a calling communication station to a called party communication station, comprising a switch (SSP 11-17, fig(s). 2; column(s) 5, line(s) 27-52) operative to generate a query in response to the receipt of the call, wherein the query includes the telephone number associated with the calling communication station (e.g., TCAP query includes a service key which is the calling party's address and digits representing the called party address, column(s) 6, line(s) 6-19); a service control point (ISCP 40, fig(s). 2) coupled with the switch, the SCP being operative to determine whether standard caller ID information for the calling communication station can be provided to the called communication station by analyzing information contained within the query (e.g., comparing the calling party's address or calling party number with data

Art Unit: 2614

stored in the call processing record (CPR); column(s) 6, line(s) 40 to column(s) 7, line(s) 62; and a service node (a peripheral unit under network control of the ISCP, column(s) 6, line(s) 60 to column(s) 7, line(s) 8) coupled with the SCP, the service node being operative to transmit a request for PIN or password to the calling communication station in response to a determination that the standard caller ID information cannot be provided to the called communication station (column(s) 7, line(s) 6-8). Bartholomew further teaches in response to this request if the caller keys a special privacy override code (PIN or password) then the call is completed without providing any caller identification information to the called communication station (col. 7, line(s) 53-62).

Bartholomew does not teach requesting for audible caller ID information to the calling communication station in response to a determination that the standard caller ID information cannot be provided to the called communication station and being operative to transmit the audible caller ID information to the called communication station.

Tatchell teaches an apparatus for processing a call from a calling party (calling party 22) at a calling communication station to a called communication station (i.e., subscriber 17a-17n), comprising means for determining whether standard caller identification information for the calling communication station can be provided to the called communication station (e.g., the CLID cannot be verified or detected; column 20 lines 50-51; see figures 8a-b steps 103 and 106); means for transmitting a request for audible caller identification information to the calling communication station in response to a determination that the standard caller identification information cannot be provided to the called communication station (e.g., agent obtains caller's name as delivered over the network or by asking the caller to say their name; figure 8b step 106);

Art Unit: 2614

and transferring the call to a voice mail system (or another location, e.g., redirect the call; column(s) 21, line(s) 38-40) in response to input from the called party (col. 21, ln. 20-40) for the purposes of providing an improved call screening and prioritization of incoming calls (column(s) 20, line(s) 39-41). Tatchell's column(s) 21, line(s) 30-40 clearly teaches transmitting a message to the calling communication in response to input from the called communication station (e.g., if the call is rejected 117, the agent forwards or sends the call to screen block announcement).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Tatchell into the teachings of Bartholomew for the purposes mentioned above.

Consider claim 75. Tatchell further teaches the steps of recording the audible caller identification information and transmitting the recorded audible caller identification information to the called telephone station (column 16 lines 20-35).

Consider claims 77, 84, 90. Bartholomew teaches a system for processing a call from a calling party at a calling communication station to a called party communication station, comprising a switch (SSP 11-17, fig(s). 2; column(s) 5, line(s) 27-52) operative to generate a query in response to the receipt of the call, wherein the query includes the telephone number associated with the calling communication station (e.g., TCAP query includes a service key which is the calling party's address and digits representing the called party address, column(s) 6, line(s) 6-19); a service control point (ISCP 40, fig(s). 2) coupled with the switch, the SCP being operative to determine whether standard caller ID information for the calling communication station can be provided to the called communication station by analyzing information contained within the query (e.g., comparing the calling party's address or calling party number with data

stored in the call processing record (CPR); column(s) 6, line(s) 40 to column(s) 7, line(s) 62; and a service node (a peripheral unit under network control of the ISCP, column(s) 6, line(s) 60 to column(s) 7, line(s) 8) coupled with the SCP, the service node being operative to transmit a request for PIN or password to the calling communication station in response to a determination that the standard caller ID information cannot be provided to the called communication station (column(s) 7, line(s) 6-8).

Bartholomew does not teach requesting for audible caller ID information to the calling communication station in response to a determination that the standard caller ID information cannot be provided to the called communication station and being operative to transmit the audible caller ID information to the called communication station.

Tatchell teaches an apparatus for processing a call from a calling party (calling party 22) at a calling communication station to a called communication station (i.e., subscriber 17a-17n), comprising means for determining whether standard caller identification information for the calling communication station can be provided to the called communication station (e.g., the CLID cannot be verified or detected; column 20 lines 50-51; see figures 8a-b steps 103 and 106); means for transmitting a request for audible caller identification information to the calling communication station in response to a determination that the standard caller identification information cannot be provided to the called communication station (e.g., agent obtains caller's name as delivered over the network or by asking the caller to say their name; figure 8b step 106) for the purposes of providing an improved call screening and prioritization of incoming calls (column(s) 20, line(s) 39-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Tatchell into the teachings of Bartholomew for the purposes mentioned above.

Consider claims 78-79, 85-86. Bartholomew further teaches that the service control point is operative to determine whether the standard caller identification information for the calling communication station is unavailable or incomplete (column(s) 6, line(s) 60 to column(s) 7, line(s) 27).

Consider claims 80 and 87. Bartholomew further teaches that the service control point is operative to determine whether the standard caller identification information for the calling communication station is blocked (column(s) 6, line(s) 60 to column(s) 7, line(s) 27).

Consider claims 81 and 88. Tatchell further teaches that the service node is operative to transmit audible messages to the calling communication station (column 21 lines 20-47).

Consider claims 82 and 89. Tatchell further teaches that the service node is operative to transmit audible messages to the called communication station (see figures 8a-d, step 106).

Consider claims 83 and 90. Tatchell further teaches that the service node is operative to receive and respond to input from the called communication station (column 21 lines 20-40).

4. Claim 73 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartholomew (5,497,414) in view of Tatchell et al (5,905,774) as applied to claims 60, 69-71 above, and further in view of Bartholomew et al (6,167,119).

Consider claim 73. Bartholomew'414 in view of Tatchell does not teach transmitting a request for the calling party to speak the name of the party upon whose behalf he or she is calling.

Bartholomew'119 teach transmitting a request for the calling party to speak the name of the party upon whose behalf he or she is calling (column(s) 43, line(s) 11-36) for the purposes of identifying individual who has been identified by voice only (e.g., caller id is not detected).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Bartholomew'119 into the teachings of Bartholomew'414 in view of Tatchell for the purposes mentioned above.

5. Claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartholomew (5,497,414) in view of Tatchell et al (5,905,774) as applied to claims 60, 69-71 above, and further in view of Jones et al (5,033,076).

Consider claim 74. Bartholomew in view of Tatchell does not teach transmitting message to indicate that the called communication does not accept calls from an unidentified calling party.

Jones teaches transmitting message to indicate that the called communication does not accept calls from an unidentified calling party (see the entire abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Jones into the teachings of Bartholomew in view of Tatchell, so that called party can screen or monitor the incoming call before answering the call in order to avoid answering nuisance, harassment, or unimportant calls.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant's arguments filed 12/15/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Appellant arguments on pages 7-9 of the Appeal Brief that neither Bartholomew nor Tatchell discloses or even suggests, "*transmitting a request for audible caller identification*". Appellant further asserted, "*if the standard caller identification were not provided to the system of Tatchell, e.g., no information is provided for comparison, then the calling party is simply blocked*". Accordingly, the examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant assertions. It is submitted that Tatchell clearly disclosed of requesting for an audible caller identification (i.e., asks for name and telephone number) to the calling station in response to a determination that the standard caller ID information cannot be provided. *Column 20 lines 49-51* of Tatchell recites, "*a check is made to determine if it (i.e., the voice call) has a CLID. If there is none or the CLID is blocked (i.e., no standard caller ID information), the agent (i.e., personal agent processor) answers the call and asks for name and telephone number*" [emphasized added]. Thus, its clearly disclosed that the personal agent processor requesting audible name and number from the calling party when there is no caller ID information or Caller ID information has been blocked. Furthermore, its clear that the system of Tatchell does not simply blocked the call when standard caller information were not provided, since the system of Tatchell requested that caller party to provides name and telephone number for further processing of the call. Thus, Tatchell disclosed of "*transmitting a request for audible caller identification*" and thereby cured the deficiency of Bartholomew. Therefore, the combination of Bartholomew in view of Tatchell rendered appellant's claimed limitations unpatentable.

Regarding appellant assertion that the combination of Bartholomew and Tatchell would simply result in a system in which a PIN was utilized to determine if the calling party was previously established on the call screening and prioritization list. Accordingly, the examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant's assertion. It is submitted that the combination would result in a system in which the "request for name and phone number" of Tatchell would ultimately replaces the "request for PIN" (see col. 7 lines 45-48) in Bartholomew in order to provides called party with audible identity of the caller. Thus, improving call screening process by enable the calling party with blocked caller ID or with unavailable caller ID information to effectively and selectively identifying him or herself to the destination party.

Appellant further argues based on the same reasoning for all of the remaining claims. Therefore, the examiner responses will be the same as those presented above.

(11) Conclusion

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,


QUOCTRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

AU 2614

Conferees:


CURTIS KUNITZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione
P.O. BOX 10395
Chicago, Illinois 60610